

serviceness and straightforward communication in protecting one's own best interests and the rights of others."

President Bowen's defense of Chaplain Fred Borsch is the most bizarre part of his letter. Borsch refers to an occasion three years ago in which an unnamed student group asked to use the Chapel because of a rescheduled event. Borsch assumes that this is what CAP was referring to when it noted that he "condones homosexuality as acceptable Christian behavior, and invited lesbian singer Holly Near to sing in the University Chapel."

Actually, Mr. Borsch is on record inviting Near and saying what he said he did. All this was published recently in a widely disseminated article in *Prospect*, "A Tale of Two Chaplains," so Borsch's seeming bewilderment at our sources must be taken as feigned. We cited Mr. Borsch's interview with *The Madison Report* in which he said he did not regard homosexuality as sinful, only "certain forms" of homosexuality which amounted to "idolatry."

"A simple view of natural religion says that there is male and there is female and that is all there is," Mr. Borsch said. "But when one looks at the variety of God's creation, not just human beings but animals too, one sees other forms of sexuality. I realize that this could be very frightening to those people who have a simple view of the world."

In fact Mr. Borsch's tortuous statements which President Bowen quotes should convince the alert reader that Borsch is trying to dodge the issue with vague references, that he does not deny that he regards homosexuality as moral behavior. In fact, we invite Mr. Bowen to provide alumni with transcripts of Borsch's discussions with gay student

President Bowen, in a clever sophism, says that because the Gay Alliance is a student organization, it should receive University support and funding and this "does not constitute endorsement." CAP raises an antecedent question: why is the Gay Alliance a student organization? Princeton should not recognize groups based solely on sexual preference; certainly the University does not (and would not) recognize or fund a Straight Student Association or a Bestiality Society.

CAP challenges Mr. Bowen to announce that Princeton would recognize and provide University space and money for the Ku Klux Klan or the Nazi group. This should not cause him discomfort because, as he says, "Recognition does not constitute endorsement." But is funding of the Gay Alliance by Princeton University not some form of endorsement? Is the fact that Princeton last year included in its alumni reunion schedule a wine and cheese party sponsored by the Gay Alliance not some form of endorsement?

In taking up Mr. Bowen's doublespeak on the issue of the clubs on Prospect Street, let us note that the resurgence of interest in the clubs for the past three years is directly proportional to lack of administration influence in club activities. Yet Mr. Bowen continues to publicly attack the clubs and privately work for a mechanism to destroy their autonomy and selectivity.

He is on record stating that all-male clubs should admit women. He has attacked Bicker as "a kind of selectivity that cuts across the learning that occurs from more random forms of association," and called for Princeton to "continue to move in the direction of a club system that does not have Bicker at its center." He "wel-

come to teach to the freshman class, tradition can disguise anachronisms. Sometimes it may even disguise evil. We still tolerate the Bicker system. . . But before you graduate you may be able to right some of these wrongs."

*What worries the Trustees of CAP is that the things that are wrong with Princeton are precisely the things that President Bowen considers best about it.*

Perhaps Mr. Bowen would tolerate a club system entirely stripped of its autonomy. Naturally such a system would be stable; it would be owned by the University. Bowen concedes that the clubs, by providing meals, lighten the burden of University dining facilities. But the clubs don't merely exist to provide food - there are ample restaurants in Princeton for that - but also to provide ambiance, to further class camaraderie, to provide the opportunity to develop special friendships, to give students of similar interests a place to which they can return, as students as well as alumni. It is this feature of the clubs that the administration seeks to eliminate.

CAP does not ask alumni not to contribute to Princeton. On the contrary. Give, by all means, and give as much as you can afford - perhaps even a bit more. But we don't believe alumni should provide Princeton with the rope on which your ideals and interests are to be hanged. We do believe that to give unrestricted gifts to the University is to risk supporting the advocacy of Marxist ideas in the classroom, the funding of the Gay Alliance, and other programs with which you may disagree.

That is why CAP urges conditioned gifts - to the library, to financial aid, to professors' salaries, to athletic departments, etc. These conditioned gifts are more important when a bequest is involved. As Mr. Bowen seems so concerned about the financial stability of the clubs, perhaps alumni should consider earmarking a percentage of this year's gift to Princeton for their own club. We also urge alumni to consider giving 10 percent of their Princeton contribution to CAP. Our point is that a gift to your club or to CAP is a gift to Princeton. We are all working to improve the University, and the only question is one of means, not ends.



The administration reacts to The Wall Street Journal editorial.